

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 10-17, 19, 20, and 23 are pending in this application.

Applicant has amended claims 1-6, 10-17, 20, and 23, and has canceled claims 9, 22, and 25. The changes to the claims made herein do not introduce any new matter.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Suzuki et al.* (“*Suzuki*”) (US 2002/0065940 A1). As will be explained in more detail below, the *Suzuki* reference does not disclose each and every feature specified in independent claim 20, as amended herein.

Applicant has amended independent claim 20 to define a control method that controls a printing apparatus. As specified in present claim 1, the control method includes, among other features, acquiring an absolute time point from another apparatus in the course of communicating with the another apparatus, where the communicating is at least one of (A) communicating to send a log representing a working status of the printing apparatus to the another apparatus, and (B) communicating to receive a printing file from the another apparatus.

The *Suzuki* reference does not disclose (or suggest) the control method defined in present claim 20. In particular, the *Suzuki* reference does not disclose (or suggest) the presently claimed feature of acquiring an absolute time point from another apparatus in the course of at least one of (A) communication with the another apparatus to send a log, and (B) communication with the another apparatus to receive a printing file.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent claim 20, as amended herein, is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Suzuki*.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sekizawa* (US 6,604,212 B2) in view of *Mallory et al.* (“*Mallory*”) (US 2002/0006136 A1). As will be explained in more detail below, the combination of *Sekizawa* in view of *Mallory* would not have rendered the subject matter defined in independent claim 1, as amended herein, obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to define a printing apparatus. As specified in present claim 1, the printing apparatus includes, among other features, a time acquisition module that acquires an absolute time point from another apparatus in the course of communication by the network communication module, where the communication is at least one of (A) communication for sending a log representing a working status of the printing apparatus to the another apparatus, and (B) communication for receiving a printing file from the another apparatus.

Neither the *Sekizawa* reference nor the *Mallory* reference discloses or suggests a printing apparatus including a time acquisition module as specified in present claim 1. Thus, for at least this reason, even if the *Sekizawa* and *Mallory* references were to be combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, this combination would not have resulted in a printing apparatus having the features specified in present claim 1. As such, the combination of the *Sekizawa* and *Mallory* references would not have rendered the subject matter defined in present claim 1 obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, independent claim 1, as amended herein, is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Sekizawa* in view of *Mallory*. Claims 2, 3, 5, and 6, each of which ultimately depends from claim 1, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

over the combination of *Sekizawa* in view of *Mallory* for at least the same reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sekizawa* in view of *Mallory*, and further in view of known prior art. Claim 4 ultimately depends from claim 1. The known prior art cited by the Examiner does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the *Sekizawa* and *Mallory* references relative to the subject matter defined in present claim 1. Accordingly, claim 4 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Sekizawa* in view of *Mallory*, and further in view of known prior art for at least the reason that this claim ultimately depends from claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 9-17, 19, 20, 22, 23, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of *Sekizawa* in view of *Mallory*, and further in view of *Suzuki* (as noted above, claims 9, 22, and 25 have been canceled). Each of claims 10-17 ultimately depends from claim 1. The *Suzuki* reference does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the *Sekizawa* and *Mallory* references relative to the subject matter defined in present claim 1. Accordingly, claims 10-17 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Sekizawa* in view of *Mallory*, and further in view of *Suzuki* for at least the reason that each of these claims ultimately depends from claim 1.

Considering next independent claim 19, this claim defines a printing system that includes, among other features, a time acquisition module that receives information on the absolute time point, which is transmitted along with a print file. None of the applied references discloses or suggests a time acquisition modules that acquires an absolute time point, *which is transmitted along with a print file*. Thus, for at least this reason, even if the *Sekizawa*, *Mallory*, and *Suzuki* references were to be combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, this combination would not have resulted in a print system having all of the

features specified in claim 19. As such, the combination of the *Sekizawa*, *Mallory*, and *Suzuki* references would not have rendered the subject matter defined in claim 19 obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, independent claim 19 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Sekizawa* in view of *Mallory*, and further in view of *Suzuki*.

Turning to independent claims 20 and 23, claim 20 is a method claim that corresponds to claim 1, and claim 23 is a computer-readable storage medium claim that corresponds to claim 1. Applicant has amended claims 20 and 23 along the same lines that claim 1 has been amended. Thus, for at least the same reasons discussed above, the result of the combination of the *Sekizawa*, *Mallory*, and *Suzuki* references would not have included each and every feature of the subject matter defined in present claims 20 and 23. As such, the combination of the *Sekizawa*, *Mallory*, and *Suzuki* references would not have rendered the subject matter defined in present claims 20 and 23 obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, independent claims 20 and 23, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Sekizawa* in view of *Mallory*, and further in view of *Suzuki*.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1-6, 10-17, 19, 20, and 23, as amended herein, and submits that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any additional

Application No. 10/726,471
Amendment dated July 15, 2009
Response to Office Action mailed April 16, 2009

fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. MIPFP068).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.

/Peter B. Martine/

Peter B. Martine
Reg. No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Customer Number 25920